



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in tracing back the line of descent of this play to an Italian comedy by GIOVAN BATTISTA DELLA PORTA. This comedy was called 'Olimpia,' and was published in Naples in 1589.

Four years prior to this, in 1585, there appeared in Paris an Italian comedy called 'L'Angelica,' by one FORNARI. These two Italian plays have a remarkable similarity, and the writer first shows that the 'Angelica,' although published four years earlier, was plagiarized from the 'Olimpia,' which probably was acted on the stage frequently before it was published. This point is established by quotations from the publisher's preface to the 'Penelope' of DELLA PORTA and from BARTOLI's 'Notizie istoriche de' Comici Italiani,' Padua 1781, and by the detailed comparison of the characters, scenes, etc., of the two plays.

The 'Angelica' seems to have had quite a success in Paris, and was translated into French anonymously. There are a number of indications which point to LARIVEY as the probable translator.

Mr. STIEFEL proceeds to show that 'Le Parasite' was based on the 'Angelica' rather than on the 'Olimpia.' This was a point not easy of determination. For, as the plots of the two Italian plays practically offer no decisive differences, it became necessary to make the most careful comparison of 'Le Parasite' with both. This the writer does, making numerous and copious quotations from all three plays. The result is as we should expect; namely, that a play which had been printed and performed at Paris should fall into TRISTAN's hands rather than one printed in Italy.

But there still remains a doubt in the writer's mind whether TRISTAN did not really use the French translation of the 'Angelica,' which appeared in 1599, and not the original 'Angelica' itself. The archaic language of 'Le Parasite' and several other circumstances seem to point in that direction, but Mr. STIEFEL has not been able to consult a copy of the translation and is reluctantly obliged to leave the decision to be made by some one else.

The three unities are strictly observed both in the two Italian plays and in the French

version, while in the latter the action has been simplified by reducing the number of the characters from fifteen to ten. The influence of the times may also be noted in the fact that parts of the Italian play where a certain amount of coarseness was introduced have been very much softened by TRISTAN. He appears in this play as an imitator and not as a mere translator, a considerable part of the dialogue and scenes being of his own invention. But in his attempt at decking out an antiquated play in a modern dress he was far less successful than either ROTROU before him, or MOLIÈRE after him.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

UNSTRESSED *wh*.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES :

SIRS :—Some time ago Prof. E. L. WALTER called my attention to the fact that he found himself saying "Wy, why?" where the exclamation was unaccented and the interrogative accented. This was the first time I had noticed a difference between strong and weak forms with *wh*, but on testing myself and others I found it the rule in my own speech and in that of a large number of the students in the university. Thus, *whatever you do; wherever you go; whenever you see 'im; wy, anyone can tell you that.* In slow and measured speech I have *wh*, in these cases, but then they are no longer weak forms. In strong forms I regularly have *wh*, except in the case of the exclamation "why!" Prof. CALVIN THOMAS first reminded me of prolonged accented "*wy, wy!*" used particularly in speaking to children. I find *why* as an exclamation to be artificial with me even when accented. This is evidently a case of substitution of the weak form for the strong, when the weak form is the more commonly used. We have an exact parallel in *yðu just ásk it þv 'er*, where the weak form of *of* (original only in such cases as *in the náme ov ál the sáints*) is used as a preposition (which is usually unaccented), although here accented. The adverb (SWEET, 'H. E. S.' § 912), which is always accented,

retains the voiceless fricative, spelled *off*; just as the interrogative *why*, which is regularly accented, also does. In the case of *wharf*, I can remember that as a child I said *warf* and was surprised when I learned the spelling. *Warf*, but not with my consonantal *r*, Prof. SHELDON (*Dialect Notes* ii, p. 42) says is common in New England. I cannot account for the *w* in this case. I see that SWEET (§ 918 end) supposes that just such a series of strong and weak forms as my speech presents existed in southern England before all *wh*'s there became *w*'s.

I cannot agree with Prof. SHELDON in supposing that *wh* in America is more or less artificial. It was only in the last century (SWEET § 918) that in Southern England *wh* began to be levelled under *w*, and not until this century that the change was carried out even there. I think it much more likely that there has been no change in the larger part of our country (as there has been none in the direction of *w* in northern England, Scotland, and Ireland), though the fact that so large a part of our population has always been of Scotch and of Irish extraction may have helped to hold us back. Personally I know of regular *w* for *wh* only in Maryland, and in certain circles in New York City.

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

BISHER UND SEITHER.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—Is not K. G. ANDRESEN's attempt to correct GOETHE in the use of the above particles, a mistake? The passage occurs on p. 101 of his well-known book: 'Sprachrichtigkeit und Sprachgebrauch im Deutschen,' 5te Auflage, Heilbronn, 1887. He says:

Zwischen *bisher* und *seither* richtig zu unterscheiden hält nicht schwer, wenn man darauf achtet, dass sich jenes auf die Ausdehnung bis zum Zeitpunkt des Sprechenden bezieht, mit *seither* aber von einer vorhergehenden Zeit an gerechnet wird. . . . Hiernach irrt Goethe, wenn er schreibt: 'Diese Produktion war es, die den Blick in eine höhere, bedeutendere Welt aus der literarischen und bürgerlichen in welcher sich die Dichtkunst *bisher* bewegt hatte, glücklich eröffnete'; es hätte *seither* heissen sollen."

The passage referred to occurs in 'Dichtung und Wahrheit' ii, 7, p. 256 (Cotta'sche Bibliothek). LESSING's service to German poetry is spoken of, and it is surely correct to use *bisher* meaning down to the time of the person or circumstances *spoken of*, as well as down to the time of the person *speaking*. It is curious to find a critic so complacently napping.

W. M. TWEEDIE.

Mt. Allison College, Canada.

THE PHONETIC SECTION.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—I have thus far received about a hundred answers to my last circular, of which I distributed 500 copies. As my statistics will be of but little value unless I get at least 200 replies, I trust this note will serve as a reminder to those of your readers who have forgotten to return the sheets sent them.

C. H. GRANDGENT,

Secretary.

19 Wendell Street, Cambridge, Mass.

BRIEF MENTION.

One is fairly at a loss, from the point of view of Romance philology, whether to shed smiles or tears over the labor expended on the establishment of the "etymology of *osteria* and similar words," in the March number of the *Classical Review*. That the author of the article in question should have felt an interest in showing how many classical scholars, great and small, have advertised their ignorance of the correct etymology of Fr. *hôte*, Ital. *oste*, etc., is not unnatural; but that the editors of the *Review* should have accorded him space to quote from books, at a length and in a manner delightfully amusing (or touchingly pathetic), the general laws of Latin and Romance phonology in their bearing on the case, without the slightest reference to any Romance etymological dictionary to see whether he was only beating empty air, must be a genuine surprise. On account of their antiquity the first two editions of DIEZ' 'Etymologisches Wörterbuch' are now difficult of access, but in the third edition, which appeared